

Sri R. M. DESAI.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that even in the first stage work, much of the land cannot be irrigated on account of the incomplete canals on the part of the Government and the Department?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It is true that something still remains to be done, but quite a large area has been brought under irrigation.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಂ. ಗುರೈದಿ.—ಇನ್ನೂ ನೀರು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಲೆವಿ, ಸೆನ್ಸು ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದರಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಜನರು ತಿಳಿಸಿವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ.—ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಲೆವಿ, ಕಂದಾಯ ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಯೋಜನೆಯಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪಡೆದವರೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ವಾಡಿಕೆ. ಎಲ್ಲ ನೀರು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಂಥ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಿಂದ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀರು ಬರುವ ಕಡೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀರು ಕೊಡುವುದು ತೀರದಾಗ ಅನೇಕರು ತಾವು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಂದಾಯ ವೆಚ್ಚ ಕೊಡಲು ತಾವು ನಿರ್ದೇಶಿಸಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri R. M. DESAI.—In question 521, for the first clause, Government have been kind enough to say that it is the Kharif irrigation project for the present. Will the Government exclude the remainig area and the Rabi area where the Government is not in a position to give timely water within the season?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—It cannot be excluded except that we are trying to give them water in time. If there is sufficient impounding of water, we are willing to give water. It depends on the rainfall.

Sri R. M. DESAI.—Till the head works are completed, will Government eliminate all rabi area?

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.—There is no question of elimination. I will have it examined.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಡ್ಕೆವಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಈಗಿರುವ ಶಾಸನದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅಚ್ಚುಕಟ್ಟುಧಾರರ ಪೈಕಿ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯಾದ ಯಾವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಬೆಳೆ ಇಡಬೇಕು, ನೀರು ಯಾವಾಗ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿ ಅವರಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ನಿಜಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೂ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಈಗಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಯೇ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question No. 445 Sri Vidvadhhar Guruji is not here. I will put it also. Hon'ble Minister for Social Welfare will reply.

Sanction of increments to the Organisers of the Women Welfare Centres of Gulbarga Distr.ct.

*Q.—445. Sri VIDYADHAR GURUJI (Gurumitkal).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether increments are being sanctioned regularly to all the Organisers of the Women Welfare Centres in Gulbarga District ;

(b) if not, the reasons for the same ?

A.—Smt. YASHODARA DASAPPA (Minister for Social Welfare).—

(a) Yes, with the exception of few cases.

(b) Increments to certain officials could not be sanctioned due to the following reasons:

- (a) Non-fixation of pay in the revised scales of pay ;
- (b) Non-discharge of duties properly ;
- (c) Availment of leave without competent sanction ;
- (d) Maternity leave ;
- (e) Being under suspension from service ;
- (f) Incomplete Service Registers.

(Nobody stood up to put supplementaries.)

Mr. **SPEAKER**.—No supplementaries ? Whoever wanted me to put the Question if there are no supplementaries? Question hour is over.

OBSERVATIONS OF THE SPEAKER *Re* : THE WALKOUT BY SOME MEMBERS AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE CHAIR AND ALSO *Re* : THE SCOPE OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. **SPEAKER**.—Before I proceed with the other work, I wish to deal with one or two matters. On the 27th, when I was away from here, certain things happened. I perused the proceedings. There appears to be a colossal confusion, I cannot put a better word, with regard to the resolution moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Home, and accepted by the House and referred to the committee. And there is also a slight confusion with regard to the motion for adjournment for discussion of certain urgent public affairs, which had been disallowed. When once the motion is disallowed, how far it could be a subject matter of protest, discussion and all sorts of things that happen on the 27th instant, has to be considered. I will first deal with the grievances mentioned about the committee that has been constituted. I find Sri Sivappa mentioning that under what rule this committee was constituted and if that can be done under no rule, why should not his Adjournment Motion, disallowed by the Speaker, be permitted to be raised before the House. I find a series of members trying to support it. I find one particular member Mr. C. J. Muckannappa referring to the Adjournment Motion saying—"Sir, two days back the Hon'ble Speaker permitted the Leader of the Opposition to intervene in the Debate on Miscellaneous Demands, and raise this issue, though it was not a proper occasion". I do not know why the member feels that it was not a proper occasion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—That was the objection raised by the other members and that was why I repeated it.

Mr. **SPEAKER**.—It looks as if the member has said this as his opinion. Why does he commit such mistakes ? When I read it, I could not make out and I wanted to clarify his mind. Now it is all right. In the course of the Debate on the Budget, every latitude is given as far as possible. On the particular day, one of the Demands was 'Miscellaneous'. Government's conduct on any subject could be